application because such a Summary is neither required by statute nor by administrative rule, as discussed in detail in applicants' amendment and response filed 8/7/95.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 17, 18, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dev et al. in view of Shing et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Dev et al. describe a system that includes a host computer and a plurality of computers, wherein the plurality of computers transmit network information to the host computer and the host computer, upon receiving the network information, stores the network information. The Examiner concedes that Dev et al. do not detail the steps of "transmitting . . . the specific user information" and "determining . . . whether the plurality of users need to receive specific user information" (See, e.g., Office Action p. 3, line 6). However, the Examiner asserts that Shing et al. describe a system that includes the above-mentioned step of "determining". The Examiner also states that although Dev et al.

> only shows the information going to a single user . . . much of the information collected would be of value to other users . . . and one of skill in the art would realize it could be easily forwarded across the network of [Dev et al.'s] figure 2 including an [sic] wireless channel . . . .

The Examiner ultimately concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Dev et al. and Shing et al. to arrive at the method of the present invention.

The applicants have herein amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to more clearly distinguish said claims from the combined teachings and suggestions of the cited references. In particular, the applicants have amended the "transmitting" step of each independent

claim to explicitly require that the specific user information be transmitted "simultaneously" to two or more users. As conceded by the Examiner, the combination of Dev et al. and Shing et al. "only shows the information going to a single user" and, therefore, does not teach or suggest transmitting user information in parallel (i.e., simultaneously) to multiple users, such as computer servers, computer networks, or computers.

Dev et al. describe a serial connection of computer networks that are interconnected either via a wireline bridge (numeral 50 in Fig. 2) or via interface devices (numerals 59 and 60 in Fig. 2) which communicate by a packet switching system, a microwave link, or a satellite link. [See Dev et al., column 4, lines 41-47]. It should be noted that the connection from the host (i.e., device communication manager (numeral 14 in Fig. 1)) to the network (numeral 18 in Fig. 1) is via a wireline data bus. Thus, Dev et al. only teaches the use of a wireless channel between computer networks and not between the host and multiple users as is claimed in the present invention.

For the sake of argument, assuming that Dev et al. suggests the use of a microwave or satellite link between the host (14) and the network (18), microwave and satellite links are well-known in the communication system art to provide point-to-point communications between two users only (e.g., between the host and one computer network interface device). Microwave or satellite links do not allow information to be broadcast to multiple users at the same time. Knowing this limitation, Dev et al. configures their system such that information transmitted from the host (14) to one of the computer networks can be forwarded in a serial manner to the other computer networks. Dev et al. then go on to state how to cope with faults that break the links between the serially connected networks. As is well-known and as particularly pointed out by Dev et al., serially connected

networks have inherent reliability issues. In serially connected networks, failure of one interface device can result in loss of connection to the host not only of the network containing the interface device, but also of every other network connected down the serial chain. Dev et al. teach a technique for identifying and coping with faults that can occur in a system that contains serially connected networks. Dev et al. does not teach or suggest avoiding the problems of serially connected networks altogether by using a parallel network and transmitting information from the host to the plurality of users simultaneously over a single radio frequency or other wireless communication channel, as in the present invention.

The Examiner notes that the specific user information "could be easily forwarded across the network of [Dev et al.'s] figure 2" which includes a wireless channel. The applicants submit that the Examiner's statement is true only when the individual network interface devices are all working properly. However, Dev et al. go to great lengths to develop a technique to detect and isolate faults that occur and disrupt communications in serially connected networks. Thus, the applicant's submit that there is nothing "easy" at all about conveying information reliably across serially connected networks. In addition, even if the information could be "easily forwarded across the network of [Dev et al.'s] figure 2," the applicants submit that forwarding across a network by definition excludes a simultaneous transfer as is now claimed in claims 1, 11, and 21 (i.e., if one network must forward to another network, a host cannot transmit to both networks simultaneously).

As now claimed in claims 1, 11, and 21, the present invention provides a method for detecting when users need updated user information and providing the updated user information to the users simultaneously over a single wireless communication channel. The applicants submit that neither Dev et al. nor Shing et al., either

individually or in combination, provide such a teaching or suggestion. In fact, the applicants submit that Dev et al. teaches away from the present invention by describing a system of serially connected networks that rely on point-to-point communications to convey information from one network (user) to another network, while Shing et al. provides all communications through wireline links. Accordingly, the applicants submit that claims 1, 11, and 21, as amended, are not obvious in view of the combined teachings and suggestions of the cited references and respectfully request that claims 1, 11, and 21 may be passed to allowance.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, 18, and 24 depend upon one of either claims 1, 11, or 21, which claims have been shown allowable above. Therefore, since claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, 18, and 24 introduce additional subject matter that, particularly when considered in the context of the recitations of their respective base claims, constitutes patentable subject matter, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, 18, and 24 are in proper condition for allowance.

4. The applicants have added new dependent claims 25-27. The new claims further limit claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, by restricting the "second single communication channel" to be a "radio frequency communication channel." The applicants submit that the new claims find support in several locations of the originally filed specification (see, e.g., page 7, line 7).

5. The applicants have also amended claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 17, 18, 21, and 24 to correct minor informalities contained therein. The applicants submit that these amendments do not introduce any new matter into the specification.

6. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile, if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary W. Grube et al.

By: _____

Daniel C. Crilly
Agent For Applicants
Registration No. 38,417
Phone: (847) 576-6939
Fax: (847) 576-3750